

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

I. Petition to Delete Inventor

On January 22, 2001, Applicant's representative filed a petition to delete David Caplan as an inventor pursuant to 37 CFR §1.48(b). Applicant did not receive confirmation from the Office regarding whether or not the petition was granted. Applicant respectfully requests that such confirmation be provided.

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 54, line 1 because "felt" should be "a felt". Applicant has amended claim 54 to correct this typographical error.

The Examiner objected to page 3 of the claims since "Claims 24-39 (canceled)" should read instead "Claims 24-36 (canceled)". Applicant has corrected this typographical error.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

The Examiner rejected claims 15-21, 23 and 37-45 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Per the Examiner's recommendation, Applicant has inserted the phrase "of an adjacent holder" after the word "slot" on line 8 of claim 15 and on line 13 of claim 37.

- 13 -

Attorney Docket No.: SHPR-01048US1 SRM/DJB
M:\DBurns\Client Matters\shpr\1048\1048US1\1048US1 RFOA 02-04-2004.doc

Accordingly, independent claims 15 and 37 are not indefinite. Claims 16-21 and 23 depend from claim 15. Claims 38-45 depend from claim 37. As such, the dependent claims are not indefinite for at least the reasons given in connection with their respective independent claims.

IV. Comments on the Examiner's Reason for Allowance


Reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and therefore no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that these comments be placed in the application file.

V. Conclusion

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/15/2004

By: 
Daniel J. Burns
Reg. No. 50,222

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 14 -

Attorney Docket No.: SHPR-01048US1 SRM/DJB
M:\DBurns\Client Matters\shpr\1048\1048US1\1048US1 RFOA 02-04-2004.doc